

Moving beyond the Dichotomy of ‘We’ and ‘They’: Retrospect and Prospect in ‘Home Anthropology’¹

Yuri Nakagawa

1. Introduction

Anthropology, as a discipline to study other cultures and societies, originated and developed in a Western milieu, and as such it was for a long time a discipline for Westerners (‘we’) who studied people (‘them’) in non-Western societies. The cornerstone of anthropology was the assumption that the culture shock anthropologists receive through their fieldwork in ‘exotic’ and ‘primitive’ settings enables them to see things that they have taken for granted with a new perspective and develop a deeper understanding of not only their own culture and society but also those of human beings in general. In other words, the original aim of anthropology was for Westerners to understand themselves through understanding others and then to eventually understand humankind. Since culture shock was thought to be an indispensable experience for anthropologists to gain a new perspective, conducting fieldwork in other places has been a key characteristic of anthropology that distinguishes it from adjacent disciplines. The idea of anthropology as the study of the ‘primitives’ held sway over the discipline for many years, and even now, when ‘primitive’ people have virtually disappeared from the earth, most anthropological studies continue to address other ‘exotic’ cultures and societies.

Notwithstanding this mainstream tendency, since the early days of the discipline a handful of anthropologists have studied their own ‘home’.² At the beginning, this new anthropological enterprise did not introduce any new topics into the discipline, nor did these anthropologists emphasise any distinctive features in the anthropological study of ‘home’.

With the changes that occurred both in and around the discipline, however, the number of anthropologists who studied ‘home’ gradually increased, and they started to stress their particularity, which in turn raised new issues such as the advantages and disadvantages of studying ‘home’ or the legitimacy of calling these studies ‘anthropology’. These changes further crystallised important issues in anthropology at large—such as the asymmetrical relationships between those who study and those who are studied, the anthropologist’s social and ethical responsibility for the people he/she studies, eurocentrism in anthropology, and inherent problems in representing others—and caused heated debates.

Moreover, with the ever-increasing process of globalisation, people, goods, and information move freely across borders on an unprecedented scale, rendering such concepts as ‘culture’ and ‘society’, which used to be closely associated with ‘place’, increasingly untenable. For a long time anthropology has been based on the premise that ‘culture’ and ‘society’ are inseparably linked to a certain ‘place’ and hence each ‘culture’ and ‘society’ has a

¹ This paper is a revised English version of the Japanese original (Nakagawa 2005).

² As will be mentioned later, defining ‘home’ is a daunting task. In this paper, the term is broadly defined as one’s own culture and society.

boundary; with this premise, anthropologists study ‘a culture’ and/or ‘a society’ as a spatially bounded, homogenous entity detached from the rest of the world. This premise is now being called into question, as are other concepts, such as ‘natives’, ‘field’, and ‘home’, that were assumed to be tied to a certain ‘place’.

This paper aims to review the history of the anthropological study of ‘home’, revisiting the debates that have appeared in its developmental process. It also discusses the impact that the rethinking of the concepts of ‘natives’, ‘field’, and ‘home’ has on anthropology and explores the prospects of ‘home anthropology’.³

2. History of Home Anthropology⁴

The history of home anthropology can be divided into three phases. The first phase was the 1960s and 1970s. In this phase, former colonies of the West, which until then had been the objects of anthropological study, gained independence one after another, and anthropologists from these former colonies began conducting studies of their own societies and cultures. Though some anthropologists prior to this period also undertook the study of their own society and culture, issues inherent in studying one’s ‘home’ and its impacts on anthropology were not addressed. In contrast, native anthropologists of this period criticised the relationship between anthropology and colonialism and the presence of Eurocentric bias in the discipline; argued over the advantages and disadvantages of studying ‘home’; and sought to find meaning in the studies of ‘home’ conducted by non-Western anthropologists.

The second phase was the 1980s, which saw an increase of Western anthropologists who began to study their ‘home’. While the debate on the advantages and disadvantages of studying ‘home’ continued, studying ‘home’ raised issues relevant to anthropology in general. Among them were arguments concerning the representation of others, which were self-reflexively debated under the influence of postmodernism.

The third phase started in the 1990s and continues up to present day anthropology. In this phase, with greater movements and exchanges of people, goods, and information than ever before, the conventional ideas of ‘field’ and ‘natives’ have become increasingly difficult to sustain. The backgrounds of anthropologists have become diversified as well, and they have endeavored to tackle new concepts of ‘home’ and ‘field’.

³ Problems of terminology will be discussed later.

⁴ Though a vast amount of excellent literature on the anthropological study of ‘home’ has been published in languages other than English (especially in non-Western languages), this section deals with only the literature published in English. There are two reasons for this limitation. One is practical: I can read only two languages (Japanese and Korean) other than English, and thus it is practically impossible for me to review the literature on ‘home’ written in other languages. The other reason has to do with the reality of anthropology: in the academic ‘world system’ of anthropology (Kuwayama 1997a), in which Anglophone scholarship has always occupied a central role in producing, disseminating, and evaluating anthropological discourse, validity aside, anthropological works are recognised only when they are written or introduced in English. As for the ‘world system’ of anthropology, see Kuwayama, who actively argues against it in his recent works and a series of debates with Jan van Bremen (1997a, 1997b, 1997c, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2004a, 2004b).

2.1. Home Anthropology by Non-Western Anthropologists

Non-Western anthropologists began to study ‘home’ as early as the 1930s. For example, Kenyatta, who later became the first Kenyan president, studied his native Kikuyu people (Kenyatta 1938). An anecdote introduced by Hayano states that when Kenyatta first presented his field material in Malinowski’s seminar, he got into a heated shouting match with a white African anthropologist, L.S.B. Leakey (Hayano 1979: 99-100). Because the argument started in English and slid into Kikuyu, ‘the exact nature of the discrepancies between Leakey and Kenyatta were never clarified’ (Wax 1976: 332, cited by Hayano *ibid.*: 100). Hayano remarked that ‘their argument pointedly raised the question of judging the validity of anthropological data by assessing the characteristics, interests, and *origin of the person who did the fieldwork*’ (1979: 100, emphasis added). However, judging from the fact that the issue of studying ‘home’ was not further addressed, the origin of the person who did the fieldwork seems not to have attracted the interest of anthropologists at that time.

Another example comes from Fei Xiaotong, a Chinese anthropologist who did his fieldwork in a village in his home province of Jiansu in 1936. Based on this fieldwork, Fei published *Peasant Life in China* (1939), which later became a classic of Chinese village studies. Malinowski lauded the book as follows:

The book is not written by an outsider looking out for exotic impressions in a strange land; it contains observations carried on by a citizen upon his own people. It is the result of work done by a native among natives. If it be true that self-knowledge is the most difficult to gain, then undoubtedly an anthropology of one’s own people is the most arduous, but also the most valuable achievement of a field-worker (1939: xix).

However, the issues of studying ‘home’, which would cause heated debates in later days, were not raised in the anthropological arena at the time.⁵

In the 1940s, Francis Hsu, Martin Yang, and some other Chinese anthropologists published their works on China (Hsu 1945, 1948; Yang 1945, Feng 1948; Hu 1948). They did not particularly emphasise the fact that non-Western scholars carried out anthropological studies on ‘home’, though Hsu and Yang much later discussed the issues unique to anthropology conducted by non-Western anthropologists and the issues related to the study of ‘home’ in general (Hsu and Textor 1978; Yang 1972). Similarly, Srinivas did his fieldwork in a village near where his ancestors had lived⁶ and published a book of his findings (1942). Being an Oxonian, however, Srinivas used the methodologies and theories he had learned at Oxford and did not particularly raise any of the issues related to studying ‘home’.⁷

⁵ Later, Leach (1982: 127) would also describe his appreciation of this work, attributing its success to the fact that Fei, who grew up in the same province, was well versed in the local dialect and knowledge.

⁶ Srinivas conducted his fieldwork in Rampura in the southern part of Karnataka State (former Mysore State). His ancestors in three or four generations migrated from neighbouring Tamil Nadu to settle down in rural southern Mysore, but his father left their village to live in Mysore City before the beginning of World War I so that he could educate his children (Srinivas 1976: 4-6).

⁷ Radcliffe-Brown, the supervisor of Srinivas at Oxford, however, stated as follows in his introduction to Srinivas’s monograph published in 1952: ‘This book, by a trained anthropologist, who is himself an Indian, and who has therefore an understanding of Indian ways of thought which it is difficult for a European to attain even

The chief characteristic of the study of 'home' conducted by non-Western anthropologists in this period is that they received their anthropological training in the West and then studied their cultures and societies in the same way that Western anthropologists studied them. They were not particularly conscious of doing anthropological study on their own 'homes'. In fact, the reason why Srinivas chose an Indian village as the target of his research was that his supervisor, Radcliffe-Brown, suggested that he conduct an intensive research project of a multi-caste village (Srinivas 1976: 1-3). This characteristic carried over into the 1950s.

The 1960s marked a change to a new phase in anthropology. During the 1960s, former colonies in Africa and Asia that had been favourable settings for Western anthropologists' fieldwork gained independence and became politically sensitive developing countries. These countries placed restrictions on fieldwork by foreign anthropologists while at the same time encouraging native anthropologists to conduct research in line with nationally defined developmental goals. Against this historical and political background, some non-Western anthropologists began to discuss the differences between studying 'home' and studying 'others' and raise issues unique to the study of 'home' (Koentjaraningrat 1964; Srinivas 1966; Uchendu 1965).

At the turn of the 1970s, Delmos Jones, an African-American anthropologist, presented a revolutionary paper titled 'Towards a Native Anthropology' (1970). In this paper, Jones suggested the establishment of 'native anthropology' as a new scholarly field of anthropology. Defining 'native anthropology'⁸ as 'a set of theories based on non-Western precepts and assumptions in the same sense that modern anthropology is based on and has supported Western beliefs and values' (1970: 251), Jones argues that 'there are native anthropologists, but there is no native anthropology', that is, 'there is little theory in anthropology which has been formulated from the point of view of tribal, peasant, or minority peoples' (ibid.: 257). In his paper, based on his experience in studying other cultures (the Papago Indians in Arizona and the Lahu in Thailand) as well as his own culture (the black community in Denver, Colorado), Jones compared these two types of anthropological study, pointed out the lack of the point of view of 'natives' in anthropology, and called for the establishment of 'native anthropology' formulated from the viewpoint of 'natives'.

The 1970s saw an upsurge of voices from non-Western anthropologists declaring the need for addressing issues raised in the practice of indigenous research. In 1977, the Association of Third World Anthropologists was founded in Huston, Texas, with the purpose 'making anthropology less prejudiced against Third World peoples by making it less ethnocentric in its use of language and paradigms' (Fahim and Helmer 1980: 645). In the following year, an international conference, titled 'Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries', was held in Burg Wartenstein, Austria, under the auspices of the Wenner-Gren Foundation. At this conference, 20 participants from 17 countries presented papers and discussed issues over a broad range of indigenous anthropology in non-Western countries—from those unique to Third World countries (such as the situation of anthropologists who had to get involved in national development projects) to those relevant to anthropology in

over many years, gives us a scientifically valuable and objective account of the religious behaviour of a particular Indian community' (Radcliffe-Brown 1952: vii).

⁸ As will be examined later, the term for an anthropology that studies 'home' varies among anthropologists. In this section, I use the terminology that each anthropologist uses in his/her writing.

general (such as the advantages and disadvantages of indigenous anthropology and possible contributions that indigenous anthropology could make to the discipline). In 1980, the summary (Fahim and Helmer 1980) and resulting comments (Colson 1980; Madan 1980; Kelman 1980; Asad 1980) were published in *Current Anthropology*. Echoing this, from the mid 1970s to the mid 1980s, many non-Western anthropologists argued about the differences between studying 'home' and studying 'others' as well as more general disciplinary issues raised in studying 'home' (Ahmed 1984; Fahim 1977; Hau'ofa 1975; Hayano 1979; Nakheleh 1973; Ohnuki-Tierney 1984; Owusu 1978; Shamshul 1982; Yang 1972).

From these arguments of non-Western anthropologists on the study of 'home,' we can extrapolate two characteristics: one is that they debated over the advantages and disadvantages of studying 'home' vis-à-vis those of studying 'others', and the other is that they raised issues of studying 'home' in the Third World in the context of criticising colonial twists persisting in anthropology. For want of space, here, I will focus on the latter.⁹

The historical relationship between anthropology and colonialism has been known for a long time. Many of the early anthropologists, who were themselves officials of their colonial government or received a commission to conduct research from the authorities, held a politically, economically, and psychologically dominant position over the people in their fieldwork settings under the colonial aegis. With the decline of colonialism after World War II, anthropology espoused cultural relativism and was believed to develop into a discipline that bridged gaps in the understanding of other cultures. Nonetheless, around the 1960s and 1970s some anthropologists, both Western and non-Western alike, began to raise their voices against colonial and Eurocentric biases deeply rooted in the methodology and theory of anthropology (Hymes ed. 1969; Asad ed. 1973; Lewis 1973; Said 1978; Huizer and Mannheim eds. 1979). In particular, Diane Lewis' paper (1973), which was published in *Current Anthropology* under the title of 'Anthropology and Colonialism', evoked an echo in the discipline. In this paper, Lewis maintained that anthropology, which presupposes the power of the researcher over the researched and hence results in the exploitation of the latter by the former, was at a deadlock in the postcolonial milieu. She further suggested that, at this crisis of anthropology, 'insider anthropology'¹⁰ could be one possible alternative. The final draft of the paper was sent for comment to 50 scholars, of whom 17 responded. Their comments were printed after the text in the paper and were followed by a reply from Lewis. While many commentators favourably received Lewis' paper and agreed with her contentions, some cast doubt on her simple dichotomy of 'outsider' versus 'insider'. The difficulty of defining 'insider' was also pointed out by many of them.

In the 1980s, with the postmodernist current in anthropology that gave rise to issues of ethnographic writing and representation, non-Western anthropologists who studied their own cultures criticised Western anthropologists for imposing their own views on indigenous peoples. This, together with other influences of postmodern anthropology, resulted in the situation known as the 'postcolonial turn' of anthropology.

Since the 1990s, or the decade of globalization, there have been active shifts of anthropologists as well as the people they study, and this has produced a considerable variety

⁹ As for the former, see my discussion in a previous paper (Nakagawa 2006).

¹⁰ Lewis also uses other terms such as 'native anthropology' and 'Third World anthropologists' in her paper.

among non-Western anthropologists studying ‘home’; some have remained based in their own countries, while others have moved their work base to Western countries or other non-Western countries, creating increasingly large gaps among them.

2.2. Home Anthropology by Western Anthropologists

The anthropological study of ‘home’ by Western anthropologists started around the 1940s.¹¹ In the 1950s and 1960s, studies of ‘home’ by eminent English and American anthropologists sporadically appeared (Firth 1956; Firth et al. 1969; Leach 1968, 1969; Mead 1967; Schneider 1968). These studies were, however, conducted by anthropologists who had already obtained fame through their ‘authentic’ anthropological studies, that is, the studies of other cultures. In other words, these works were, so to speak, sidelines for them, and as such they did not specifically raise issues of conducting anthropological studies of ‘home’.

Since around the 1970s, there have been an increasing number of Western anthropologists who choose ‘home’ as their main research subject, and in 1981, *Anthropology at Home in North America* (Messerschmidt ed.), a collection of papers by anthropologists based in North America, was published. Further, the 1985 ASA (Association of Social Anthropology) conference held at the University of Keele was based on the theme of anthropology ‘at home’. Of the 39 papers presented at the conference, 13 selected papers were published in the volume *Anthropology at Home* (Jackson ed. 1987). This volume was not technically limited to ‘anthropology at home’ in Europe, as three papers were not on Europe (i.e., one was on India, one on Africa, and the other on Israel). Nonetheless, with its 10 papers on Europe, this volume mainly dealt with studies of ‘home’ in Europe.¹²

In the introduction of each volume, Messerschmidt and Jackson respectively analyse the reasons for the increase in studies of ‘home’ in the West (Messerschmidt 1981: 6-12; Jackson 1987: 8-9). Both mention first and foremost the decrease of funding for anthropological research. Moreover, both also refer to the strong tendency of many newly independent states to object to Western anthropologists conducting research within their borders. In addition, Messerschmidt points out some other reasons. First, well-trained non-Western anthropologists have entered a discipline ‘that was formerly the research monopoly of predominantly white, male Euro-American anthropologists’ (1981: 10) in increasing numbers. Second, students studying relatively new fields, such as urban studies, medical anthropology, aging, education, women’s and ethnic studies, law, and social impact assessment and analysis, have begun to address problems closer to ‘home’. Finally, the most important aspects of ‘anthropology at home’ are, Messerschmidt argues, its pragmatism and its contribution to anthropological theory. Jackson, on the other hand, describes the following factors as having helped pull anthropological research ‘home’: increased student numbers, the discovery of large areas of ignorance about one’s own society, the current interest shown by historians in using anthropological insights to interpret past records, the ease of access to one’s own society, and

¹¹ For example, Margaret Mead published *American Character* in 1944.

¹² Jackson, the editor of this volume, states that this imbalance is not due to ethnocentrism. A few of the reasons, he explains, are that the majority of ASA members are Europeans, that a third of the younger members are interested in European research, and that nearly two-thirds of the papers given at the conference were about Europe (1987: 1).

the reductions in time and money needed for fieldwork.

As we can see, there is a wide range of reasons and factors to study 'home', from very practical reasons to highly intellectual and academic ones. Whatever the reason, the studies of 'home' conducted by Western anthropologists in this period, combined with the trend to question the anthropological enterprise and the act of writing ethnography, were strongly tinged with a meta-anthropology that investigates not so much 'home' as 'the study of home'. This led to the 'postcolonial turn' in anthropology mentioned in the previous section. The next section will elaborate on this trend in anthropology during this period.

2.3. Reflexive Anthropology and Postmodern Anthropology

From the mid-1970s to the 1980s, a growing number of anthropologists in the West turned to what is called 'reflexive anthropology' and critically reflected on their anthropological practice (Okely 1975; Babcock 1980; Parkin ed. 1982; Ruby ed. 1982; Overing ed. 1985).¹³ Traditionally, anthropologists have concentrated on explaining the function of social systems, institutions, rules, and customs of a given society, using the data collected from informants through fieldwork. However, reflexive anthropology argues that none of these systems, institutions, rules, or customs can be substantial outside the context that imposes meanings on them, and that these meanings are mutually constructed by both the researcher and the researched in the field situation and hence always subject to changes. What anthropologists need to do is therefore not to explain the function of these systems, institutions, rules, or customs, but to describe the process through which the meanings given to them are created. Reflexivity by anthropologists on both themselves, who take part in the process, and the situation that allows them to do so is an inevitable part of approaching and understanding 'others'.

In the 1980s, when the influence of postmodern discourse, which became increasingly prevalent especially in the United States, reached anthropology as well as other social disciplines, the political implications inherent in the act of 'writing ethnography' and other issues related to representing 'other cultures' emerged as big concerns in anthropology; papers and volumes dealing with these issues were published one after another (Marcus 1980; Marcus and Cushman 1982; Clifford and Marcus ed. 1986; Marcus and Fischer 1986; Clifford 1988; Geertz 1988; Spencer 1989).

Among them, *Writing Culture*, a volume edited by Clifford and Marcus and published in 1986, had a particularly significant impact on the discipline. The authority required for 'writing ethnography', namely representing other cultures, is unevenly distributed and heavily depends on particular historical and/or political situations. Every act of ethnographic writing is thus inherently designed to meet the interests and needs of particular people in a particular time and place, and hence ethnographic truths are always those that hold true only under certain historical and/or political situations. Based on this recognition, it was argued that ethnographies are 'fictions' and as such they should be treated as 'texts' rather than as true

¹³ Though reflexivity in anthropology emerged in the late 1960s and the term 'reflexive anthropology' was coined by Scholte as early as 1969 (Scholte 1969), it was not until the mid 1970s that the importance of reflexivity in anthropology was vigorously argued and ethnographies that applied reflexivity were written.

accounts of other cultures (Clifford 1986: 6-7). This argument, questioning the taken-for-granted relationship between Western anthropologists, who observe and describe, and non-Western 'others', who are observed and described, and undermining the authority and validity of ethnographic research and writing, made such a significant impact on anthropology that even the term 'Writing Culture shock' was coined. Since the emergence of this 'postmodern anthropology', anthropologists have come to address the process through which they observe, interpret, and write about 'others', the historical and/or political situations that allow them to do so, and the anthropologists themselves who practice anthropology—and in particular 'write ethnography'.

With the influence of 'reflexive anthropology' and 'postmodern anthropology', Western anthropologists have turned their eyes to themselves, but this has not lead to a simple study of 'home'; on the contrary, it developed into a kind of meta-anthropology with a strong tone of self-criticism.

If, for anthropology, the 1980s was 'the decade of shock' with the storm of postmodernism, then the 1990s was 'the decade of the collapse of anthropological concepts associated with place' concurrent with the effects of globalisation. As a result, with people frequently moving across national borders from one society to another, it has become increasingly difficult to associate such concepts as 'culture', 'society', and 'ethnic group' with a particular geographic area. Similarly, concepts such as 'field' and 'native' have been placed under intense scrutiny. This recent trend of anthropology will be further discussed later in this paper.

As we have seen, anthropologists have used various terms to refer to the anthropological study of 'home', and in fact there are various types as well. In the next section, we will examine both the terms and types of the anthropological study of 'home'.

3. The Terms and Types of the Study of 'Home'

A Japanese proverb states that names and natures often agree. Similarly, the facts that there are various terms for the study of 'home' and that none of them covers the whole range of the study of 'home' indicate the variety of types of study and the tangle in which it finds itself.

While there has been criticism about the division of anthropologists by the simple dichotomy of 'indigenous' and 'foreign' or that of 'insider' and 'outsider' (Stuchlik 1973: 598; Fahim and Helmer 1980: 647; Kelman 1980: 658; Aguilar 1981:25), such terms have still been applied to the study of 'home', mostly depending on whether the anthropologist who conducts the study is Western or not. The two major terms applied to research done by non-Western anthropologists are 'native anthropology/anthropologist' (Jones 1970; Lewis 1973: 591; Nakhele 1973; Ohnuki-Tierney 1984; Mascarenhas-Keyes 1987; Limón 1991; Motzafi-Haller 1997; Norman 2000: 21) and 'indigenous anthropology/anthropologist/ethnographer' (Fahim 1977; Shamsul 1982; Clifford 1986: 9; Strathern 1987: 29; Gefou-Madianou 1993). The word 'native' primarily means 'born in that place' or 'belonging to a place by birth', as in 'native New Yorker'. It is also used to refer to something obtained by birth or achieved in the setting given by birth, as in 'native beauty' or 'a native speaker of English'. Thus the term 'native

anthropology' has been often used for the study of people who belong to the same national, linguistic, or cultural group as that of the researcher. One such example would be the study of the Japanese American community by a Japanese anthropologist. However, as Appadurai points out, in anthropology the word 'native' has been used very restrictedly for the people and groups anthropologists have traditionally studied, that is, people and groups in distant places from the metropolitan West (1988: 36-37). In fact, when a Western anthropologist studies his/her 'home', the term 'native anthropology' is hardly ever used. Moreover, the historical fact that people of the colonising states called the people in their colonies 'natives' gives a pejorative tone to the word, depending on the context. While some anthropologists avoid the term 'native anthropology' due to the connotations the word 'native' could have (Suenari 1992: 60), others intentionally use 'native anthropology' because it testifies to the colonial roots of the discipline (Kuwayama 2004a: 3).¹⁴

The word 'indigenous' means 'existing naturally in the local environment' or 'originating in or characterising a particular region or country'. Though the word is generally regarded as a synonym of 'native', it does not carry as pejorative a connotation as the word 'native'.¹⁵ This could be part of the reason why, in the abovementioned international conference titled 'Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries', the term 'indigenous anthropology' was proposed as a working concept referring to the practice of anthropology in one's native country, society, and/or ethnic group in the non-West (Fahim and Helmer 1980: 644). Elizabeth Colson, one of the participants in the conference, argued that 'indigenous' is a misnomer when applied to the study of one's own in non-Western countries because every anthropologist is indigenous somewhere, and the majority of anthropologists at some time deal with their own communities. She used the term 'Third World' instead (1980: 650). Nevertheless, when 'indigenous' is used in anthropology, it is often used as opposed to the word 'Western', as indicated by the title of a book edited by Driessen (*The Politics of Ethnographic Reading and Writing: Confrontations of Indigenous and Western Views*, 1993). Though Lewis used both 'Third World' as well as 'native' in her abovementioned paper (1973: 588-590), the term 'Third World' is not appropriate, for it excludes those non-Western anthropologists who do not belong to the Third World.

Further, such terms as 'citizen anthropologist' (Cheater 1987), 'non-Western anthropologist' (Kim 1990), and 'non-Euro-American anthropologist' (Koentjaraningrat 1964) have also been used. None of these terms literally means 'studying one's own culture or society', and yet they are used to refer to non-Western anthropologists studying 'home'. The reason for this usage is, as Asad points out, that until very recently there was an asymmetrical relationship in anthropology in which most Western anthropologists were concerned with the study of 'others' in non-Western countries while their non-Western counterparts conducted studies of themselves. However, at present this asymmetrical relationship is breaking up, and thus this usage is no longer considered appropriate.

¹⁴ Two more reasons Kuwayama sticks to the term 'native' are, he argues, that the term 'native anthropology' suggests 'the "intrusion" into the academic space of former colonial powers by their subjects', and that the intrusion 'signals the radical change taking place in the structure of anthropological knowledge' (2004a: 3).

¹⁵ In some societies, however, the word 'indigenous' has political implications. For example, in Malaysia, the word refers to people of Southeast Asian origin and excludes the Chinese and Indian citizens (Tan 2004: 307-308).

Recently some anthropologists have started using the broader term ‘local anthropology / anthropologist’ (Yamashita et al 2004: 15; Tan 2004: 308). On one hand, this term is handy because it includes both Western and non-Western anthropologists. It is also applicable to those who study a country or society that may be their base but not their native place. On the other hand, because the term has a strong connection with place, it cannot be applied when what the researcher and the researched have in common is not place, as in the abovementioned example of a Japanese anthropologist studying the Japanese American community, or in a case in which a researcher only shares a particular culture with informants, as in the case of Wulff (i.e., ballet), which we will discuss later (Wulff 2000).

The most often used terms for the study of ‘home’ by Western anthropologists are ‘anthropology at home’ (Messerschmidt ed. 1981; Jackson ed. 1987) and ‘auto-anthropology’ (Strathern 1987). Though the term ‘anthropology at home’ does not exclude the study of ‘home’ by non-Western anthropologists, it is generally reserved for Western anthropologists, as the study of ‘home’ by non-Western anthropologists is more often referred to by other terms such as ‘native-’ or ‘indigenous anthropology’. ‘Home anthropology/anthropologist’ is also used (Norman 2000: 121), but it is not restricted to Western anthropologists (Suenari 1992).

Messerschmidt uses three different terms to classify ‘anthropology at home’; ‘insider anthropology’ for North American anthropologists at home, ‘native anthropology for ethnic or minority anthropologists at home, and ‘indigenous anthropology’ for anthropologists at home in the Third World (1981:13). This classification can, to some extent, avoid the criticism that anthropologists with diverse backgrounds—such as one from an impoverished American minority, one from a Third World elite group, and one from a middle class white group—should not be subsumed under the rubric of ‘native’ anthropologist (Narayan 1993: 677). Nevertheless, limiting the term ‘insider’ to North American anthropologists could cause confusion, for the word has been frequently used in a much wider context than that of whether the anthropologist is Western or non-Western, let alone whether he/she is North American or not (Srinivas 1966: 154; Lewis 1973: 589; Suenari 1992: 61, 63; Aguilar 1981). Furthermore, non-Western anthropologists who are not from the Third World are left out of these three categories.

While some criticise dividing anthropology and/or anthropologists into just two categories of ‘native’ and ‘non-native’ or ‘Western’ and ‘non-Western’ (Asad 1980; Narayan 1993)¹⁶, others argue that the anthropological study of ‘home’ by Western anthropologists is different from that by non-Western anthropologists. Strathern terms the former ‘auto-anthropology’, defines it as ‘anthropology carried out in the social context which produced it’, and contends that it has a limited distribution (1987: 17). The determinant of whether the anthropologist is at home or not, she argues, is not his/her personal credentials but what he/she writes in the end, namely, ‘whether there is cultural continuity between the

¹⁶ Asad argues that it is not useful to distinguish between Western and non-Western ‘anthropology’ as two different sets of paradigms, theories, and methods, but rather that the distinction between Western and non-Western ‘anthropologists’ may be significant because of the distinctive asymmetry between Western anthropologists concerned with ‘others’ in non-Western countries and non-Western anthropologists with their own countries (1980: 661-662). On the other hand, Narayan, who has an Indian father and a half German and half American mother, criticises the stiff distinction between ‘native’ and ‘non-native’ anthropologists (1993: 671-672).

products of his/her labours and what people in the society being studied produce by way of accounts of themselves' (1987: 17). In this respect, non-Western anthropologists do not have the same relationship to their own society or culture as a Western anthropologist does to his/hers (1987: 30), as the latter study 'home' by using concepts—'society', 'culture', 'class', 'socialisation', 'role', 'relationship', and 'community', etc.—that originated and developed in their own society or culture, whereas the former do not. 'Auto-anthropology' is thus only possible in the West, where 'the anthropological "knowledge" draws on concepts which also belong to the society and culture under study' (1987: 18), but it results in 'rendering back, to the culture or society from which it comes, the culture's central constructs, such as "relationship", "role", or more particularly the concept of "culture" itself' (1987: 27) in a tautological fashion.

On the contrary, Strathern argues, in the case of indigenous anthropologists, investigations at 'home' may well constitute a form of personal knowledge but do not contribute to self-knowledge in anthropology, and hence it is not auto-anthropology. Rather, she states, it is much more like Malinowskian anthropology, which meditates between different worlds (1987: 29, 35), namely, it is closer to traditional foreign anthropology conducted by Western anthropologists. In other words, by applying concepts developed in Western culture to their own culture or society, non-Western anthropologists studying 'home' are conducting a kind of comparative study. In contrast, their Western counterparts cannot do even this kind of comparison because the concepts they apply to the culture or society under study are the very products of the culture and society. What Strathern calls 'auto-anthropology' thus presents itself only in a tautological form.

Strathern is not the only figure to argue that anthropology is a form of Western culture. For instance, Haas states that anthropology itself belongs to Western culture (1965: 1557), and Rapport and Overing regard anthropology as 'a folk discourse of the West (or, at least, an academically distilled and derived one), dealing with notions' developed in the West (2000: 23). There may well be some truth in their remarks, and if we follow Strathern's definition of auto-anthropology, the anthropological enterprise of 'home' by non-Western anthropologists—analysing and writing about their culture and society with borrowed concepts from the West—cannot be auto-anthropology, regardless of whether the expected readership of their products is in the West or in their own society.

Nevertheless, could we really go so far as to say that the cultural continuity Strathern mentions necessarily exists when the anthropologist and the people being studied are both Westerners, or that it can never exist when the anthropologist is from the West and his/her informants are non-Westerners? For instance, do all English people, regardless of their class or education, explain themselves by using notions such as 'society', 'culture', 'class', 'socialisation', 'role', 'relationship', and 'community', just as anthropologists do? Or, if an American anthropologist chooses the Japanese academic world of anthropology as his/her research object, can we assert that there is no cultural continuity between what he/she writes in the end and what Japanese anthropologists render by way of accounts of themselves? Again, as we can see in Kim's case (Kim 1977), if a non-Western anthropologist carries out anthropological research in the United States and publishes the results with maximal use of anthropological concepts developed in the West for American readership, can such research be considered auto-anthropology? Even if the tools are the same, is the end result different

depending on whether the user is Western or non-Western?

The rethinking or reexamining of anthropology and its concepts in terms of the relationship between the ethnographic writer (or anthropologist) and his/her readership (or audience) has been vigorously undertaken, especially since the emergence of postmodern anthropology. On one hand, some valuable arguments contributing to anthropology have been produced through this process. On the other hand, arguments of this kind are prone to fall into abstraction, overlooking the diversity of relationships between writer and reader. We thus should always bear in mind the possibility that various types of ethnographic writing are often lumped together.

It is true, however, that introducing ‘readership (audience)’ into the dyad of anthropologist and informants is useful to classify the types of anthropologists. Yamashita, Bosco, and Eades set two dimensions—similarity between anthropologist and informants and similarity between intended audience and informants—and created a model with four quadrants, each of which identifies a type of anthropologist (2004: 15-16, 18). In this classification, ‘home’ anthropologists, who share a common language and cultural background with their informants, are divided into ‘indigenous’ and ‘native’ by their intended readership; those who write for local readers are defined as ‘indigenous’, and those who write for foreign ones as ‘native’. For instance, a Japanese anthropologist who conducts fieldwork in a Japanese village is classified as ‘indigenous’ if he writes ethnography in Japanese for Japanese readership. In contrast, if he/she publishes the results in a foreign language for foreign readership, he/she is classified as ‘native’. Anthropologists who study ‘others’ are also divided into two types depending on their relationship with informants and readership; those who share a common language and cultural background with their readers are defined as ‘regular/

Figure 1: Difference and sameness among audience, fieldworker, and informant



Source: Yamashita et al. (2004: 18) *The example of each type in the original is omitted.

exotic', and those who do not are defined as 'foreign experts/Cassandra'.¹⁷ An example of the former would be an American anthropologist who carries out overseas fieldwork in an 'exotic' place, returns to the United States, and writes an ethnography in English. Anthropologists of this type have comprised mainstream anthropology for a long time. In the case of the latter, on the other hand, an anthropologist conducts fieldwork in a foreign setting, with informants whose language and cultural background are different from his/hers, and then publishes in the language of the informants. Yamashita et al note that this type is rare, giving as an example the case of Kim Choong Soon, a Korean-born anthropologist who did his fieldwork on race relations in the southern United States and published the results in English (2004: 16).

This model sorts out the relations among the triad—'anthropologist', 'informant', and 'reader'—and helps us to think about two important aspects of anthropological practice: conducting fieldwork and writing ethnography. As is often the case with typology, however, it cannot help but leave out those cases that belong to more than one type or those that do not fit into any of the four types. Giving examples of those who publish papers and books in their native language as well as English,¹⁸ Yamashita et al themselves note that the distinction between 'native' and 'indigenous anthropology' is not fixed, such that making a clear distinction between 'native' and 'indigenous' anthropology is often problematic (2004: 16-17).

Moreover, this model misses anthropologists who neither share a common language nor cultural background with their informants or audience. For example, an anthropologist from a non-Anglophone country who does his/her fieldwork in another non-Anglophone country and publishes the results in English does not fit into any of the four types shown in Figure 1.¹⁹ Nonetheless, the number of this type of anthropologist is rapidly growing.

As shown thus far, the terms used for anthropology that deals with 'home' are problematic enough even when limited to English. As for these terms in Japanese, the problem becomes even more complicated. In Japan, anthropology that takes 'home' as its object of study is not yet recognised as a branch of the discipline, let alone given a name. This does not mean that Japanese anthropologists rarely study 'home'. On the contrary, a lot of Japanese anthropologists have fieldwork experience in Japan, if not as their main field site. Nevertheless, unlike many other branches of anthropology, such as developing anthropology, medical anthropology, and feminist anthropology, anthropology that focuses on 'home' has not been established.²⁰

Translating English terms into Japanese therefore seems to be a solution, but this is no easy task. As we have already examined, even in English there is no term that encompasses all

¹⁷ 'Cassandra' was a princess of Troy who had the gift of prophecy but was fated never to be believed. The reason for the use of the term 'Cassandra' is, as Yamashita et al explain, that anthropologists of this type sometimes feel that their audience does not take them seriously (2004: 16).

¹⁸ Examples given by Yamashita et al here are the Australian-based Japanese sociologist, Yoshio Sugimoto, and the Japanese anthropologist, Takami Kuwayama.

¹⁹ Nakane and Tanabe, Japanese anthropologists who did fieldwork in India and Thailand, respectively, and Moon, the Korean anthropologist who carried out fieldwork in Japan, are examples of this type, as they all published their results in English (Nakane 1967; Tanabe 1994; Moon 1989).

²⁰ There are several background factors involved in this situation, among which are the relationships with Japanese folklore studies that deal with Japanese folk cultures, the trend of Japanese anthropological circles in which Western-style anthropology (that is, studying 'other cultures') is dominant, and very little concern in identifying ourselves as 'natives', which is due to a lack of colonial experience. For more details on this issue, see Nakanishi (2003).

of the diversities of the study of 'home'. 'Home anthropology' and 'anthropology at home', when used to describe anthropology studying 'home' either in the West or non-West, are regarded as the most generic terms. This is because the term 'home' can be used to refer to one's family, village, town, and country. It can also be used to refer to the place where one was born and used to live, or the place where one is now living. In Japanese, however, there is no such convenient word, and thus it is hard to find a proper Japanese translation for 'home'. It is also difficult to find a satisfactory Japanese equivalent for the word 'insider', as in 'insider anthropology'. Some anthropologists make distinctions between 'native anthropology' and 'indigenous anthropology', but it is very hard to apply different Japanese translations for 'native' and 'indigenous'. Moreover, when translated into Japanese, the multiple meanings that the original English words carry are lost. Another solution is giving up the translation of the meaning into Japanese words and instead using *katakana* (the Japanese syllabary used for loan words mainly borrowed from western languages) for English words such as 'home', 'insider', 'native', or 'indigenous'. In this case, however, we have to sort out the differences among these words and the anthropologies denoted by these words. Otherwise, such words only invite more confusion.

In the above debate over the English terms, the main issue was whether it was a Western anthropologist or non-Western anthropologist who conducted the study. In either case, however, an anthropologist's 'homeness' differs greatly depending on the physical, psychological, and social distance between the anthropologist and the people whom he/she studies. These differences may go unrecognised if we too much focus on whether the anthropologist is a Westerner or non-Westerner, or whether he/she belongs to the Third World or not. Therefore the degree of 'homeness' needs to be investigated. In a recent paper (2006), I choose 'nationality', 'ethnicity', 'language', and 'culture' as the elements to assess 'home' and investigate how many and which elements must be shared by the anthropologist and the people he/she studies in order for a study to be considered a 'home anthropology'. Here I would like to examine the degree of 'homeness' of each element.

When an anthropologist carries out fieldwork in the same country of which he/she holds nationality, in a broad sense, it is considered to be home anthropology, but there are some cases in which it is not. For example, when a Han Chinese anthropologist conducts fieldwork with an ethnic minority group in China, it falls a little short of doing fieldwork in a foreign country, apart from some technicalities (for instance, he/she does not need a visa). Even when a Han Chinese anthropologist carries out fieldwork with Han Chinese people, if their first languages and cultural backgrounds are quite different, the degree of 'homeness' is relatively small, as in the case of a Han Chinese anthropologist from Beijing doing fieldwork in Sichuan Province. The case of English anthropologist Judith Okely further shows that doing fieldwork at one's home in one's mother tongue may not necessarily be reckoned as a study with high 'homeness'. In her account of fieldwork with Gypsies in the Home Counties, Okely remarks how she had to learn another language in the words of her mother tongue. She further notes: 'I unlearned my boarding school accent, changed clothing and body movements' (1984: 5).

Contrary to the aforementioned cases, when people of the same ethnic group are dispersed in various countries, overseas fieldwork could be considered close to one at home. A Japanese anthropologist studying the Japanese-American community in Hawaii or a Han Chinese anthropologist from Fujian Province working with the Fujians in Malaysia are

examples of this type, though in such cases the researcher would need a visa, and there may be differences in language and/or customs between him/her and the informants. Nonetheless, they would tend to share more cultural traits and be psychologically closer than the above examples of home anthropology.

Even when fieldwork takes place in one's home country with people belonging to the same ethnic group, in a society that is deeply divided by class and wealth, such as India, fieldwork targeting people of a totally different social class from one's own has very little 'homeness' because of the psychological and social distance between the researcher and the researched, even though they share the language and culture in a broad sense.²¹

Fieldwork in a society with little class differentiation like Japan also has gradations. Probably the most popular type of domestic fieldwork in Japan is one in which an anthropologist goes to a place alien to him/her or his/her family. In this case, the anthropologist leaves his/her everyday life at home, moves to the field by vehicle, and stays there, for either a short or long time period, for fieldwork.²² When an anthropologist does fieldwork with people or in a place with which he or she already has some kind of connection, the 'homeness' of the fieldwork is higher even if it also requires moving and staying there. Cases that fall under this category include fieldwork with members of the clan to which the anthropologist or his/her spouse belongs, fieldwork in the area where the anthropologist used to live, and fieldwork in his/her parent's hometown or in places where his/her relatives or affinities are living.

Sometimes fieldwork may not require moving. Some anthropologists choose a part of their everyday life as the object of their study. An example is the research conducted by Canadian anthropologist Noel Dyck. While attending and helping community sport activities for his children, Dyck got interested in social relationships through community sport, children's sporting activities, and child rearing. He decided to turn them into a professional enquiry and, while attending these activities as a parent or a coach as before, conducted anthropological research on them—the activities that had already become taken-for-granted parts of his life (2000). This type of fieldwork has a very strong degree of 'homeness'.

As we have examined, with different physical, psychological, and social distances between the investigator and the investigated, home anthropology covers a very wide spectrum from research that is literally 'at home' to research that is substantially the same as that conducted in a foreign setting.

The examples of 'home' mentioned above are those defined by area and/or ethnicity, but 'home' does not necessarily have to do with area or ethnicity. Swedish anthropologist Helena Wulff (2000), making the most of her experience as a ballerina, investigated the ballet world, a very closed world with a distinctive culture of its own. She carried out her main research on three national classic ballet companies in Stockholm, London, and New York, but regardless of where she did her fieldwork, her research is considered to be a form of home anthropology

²¹ See Srinivas (1976).

²² In Japan, most anthropologists do not carry out long-term domestic fieldwork but repeated short-term fieldwork. The small size of the country and its good transportation systems allow this kind of fieldwork, but more precisely speaking, most of us cannot do otherwise, as the sabbatical system is not well developed at Japanese universities. Another reason may be that grants and/or funds for anthropological research are easier to obtain for overseas projects than domestic ones.

because she conducted fieldwork on her ‘home ground’.

A case opposite to this is presented by Russell Shuttleworth (2004), an American anthropologist who carried out his research on sexual intimacy for men with cerebral palsy. Being nondisabled, Shuttleworth does not share the disability culture, and as such he conducted his fieldwork with disabled people as an outsider even though his field site was his local East San Francisco Bay Area. Shuttleworth, in his reminiscent account, writes that he was anxious as to whether he had the right, as a nondisabled person, to research and write about disabled people’s sexual lives, or whether he exploited the underlying power relations between him and the disabled people he studied (2004: 48).

While the cases of Wulff and Shuttleworth show us that the sharing or not sharing of special knowledge or culture creates a ‘home’ or ‘field’ that transcends a particular area or ethnicity, the growing flow of people, goods, and information across boundaries produces people who do not have an area- or ethnicity-bound ‘home’ among anthropologists as well as the people they study. Parallel to this, ‘culture’ and ‘society’ can also move and mingle across borders, making both ‘native’ and ‘field’—concepts that have traditionally been confined to one place—increasingly unsustainable.

4. Who is the ‘Native’? What is the ‘Field’?

The concept of the ‘native’, the object of anthropological study, has traditionally been the cornerstone of the discipline. Today, however, the concept is challenged by influential voices that point out the gaps between the concept and the reality, and the oversimplification of the concept. Appadurai argues that natives who are incarcerated in particular places distant and distinct from the metropolitan West, unaffected by contact with the outside world, and hence confined by a specific mode of thought, are ‘creatures of the anthropological imagination’ (1988: 39). He further illustrates, with ethnographic examples, that this is applicable not only for the ‘natives’ in today’s complex, highly interconnected, media-dominated world but also for most of the groups anthropologists have studied. ‘(M)y general case’, argues Appadurai, ‘is that natives, people confined to and by the places to which they belong, groups unsullied by contact with a larger world, have probably never existed’ (ibid.).

Nevertheless, anthropologists have succeeded in holding on to the idea of the ‘native’ despite a large amount of information that has militated against it. The reason for this, according to Appadurai, is that anthropology has operated through ‘anthropology of images...whereby some feature of a group in a particular place is regarded as quintessential to the group and as especially true of that group in contrast with other groups’ (Appadurai 1988: 39-40). For instance, in anthropological discourse, hierarchy is associated more strongly with India than with any other place, so that Indian natives have been incarcerated in the image of hierarchy (1988: 40). Honour-and-shame with the circum-Mediterranean region, ancestor-worship with China, and *compadrazgo* with Hispanic America are some other examples. Appadurai points out that the images linking places and cultural themes in anthropological discourse ‘cost us more in terms of the richness of our understanding of places than they benefit us in rhetorical or comparative convenience’ (1988: 45-46). He argues that in today’s globalised world, groups that anthropologists have studied are ‘no longer tightly territorialized,

spatially bounded, historically unselfconscious, or culturally homogenous' (1991: 191) and proposes a new concept, 'the ethnoscape', the landscape of moving groups and persons—tourists, immigrants, refugees, exiles, guest workers, and others—who constitute an essential features of today's shifting world (1991: 192).

In order to adapt ethnographic practices of fieldwork and writing to new conditions in the world, George Marcus presents 'multi-sited ethnography' as a way of investigating culturally connected, but geographically dispersed, people and/or phenomena (1995, 1999). Recently a gradually increasing number of anthropologists are using this approach to study moving people and/or cultural phenomena that cannot be bound to one place (Strauss 2000; Wulff 2000; Muir 2004; Kurotani 2004; Teiwa 2004).

At issue here are not only people whom anthropologists study or cultural phenomena. Anthropologists themselves could have more than one ethnic ancestry or cultural background and thus have mixed or multiple identities. When they find their identities as both Westerners and non-Westerners, their conceptualisation of the 'native' is somewhat different from both Western and non-Western anthropologists. Kirin Narayan, who has an Indian father and a German-American mother and has lived in both India and the United States, does not see herself clearly as 'native' nor 'non-native' but as 'halfies'²³ (1993: 673), and she argues against the fixity of a distinction between 'native' and 'non-native' anthropologists (1993: 671). She maintains that the critique that Appadurai provides on the 'native' as an anthropological imagination can also be extended to 'native anthropologists', that is, the imagination that assumes a 'native' anthropologist is an insider who will provide an authentic point of view—'an authentic point of view' here does not mean that of anthropologists but that of 'natives'—to the anthropological community. Identities doled out to non-Western, minority, or mixed anthropologists are therefore those that highlight their exotic differences rather than commonalities or complexities. Mixed anthropologists with American mothers and non-white fathers are portrayed in a way that the non-white elements of their ancestry are emphasised,²⁴ and the fact that they are often distanced by factors such as education, class, emigration, or the like, from the societies they are supposed to represent tends to be underplayed (1993: 675-676). Narayan deplores (1993: 677):

(W) hile it is hoped that we will contribute to the existing anthropological pool of knowledge, we are not really expected to diverge from prevailing forms of discourse to frame what Delmos Jones has called a genuinely 'native' anthropology as 'a set of theories based on non-Western precepts and assumptions' (1970: 251).

This critique of Narayan will be further examined in the next section.

While the concept of 'bounded field' associated with place can no longer be tenable to study people moving across conventional borders and boundaries, the increasing global mobility of anthropologists themselves also forms a new concept of 'field' that blurs the

²³ Borrowing the term from Narayan through personal communication, Abu-Lughod defines 'halfies' as 'people whose national or cultural identities is mixed by virtue of migration, overseas education, or parentage' (1991: 137).

²⁴ The examples Narayan provides are the 'Tewa' Alphonso Ortiz, the 'Chicano' Renato Rosaldo, and the 'Arab' Lila Abu-Lughod (1993: 677).

conventional distinction of 'home' and 'field'. Caroline Knowles, a British anthropologist with English and Irish ancestry, moved to Quebec and settled there, conducting research on the life-story narratives of black people diagnosed as schizophrenic both in London and Montreal. Both London and Quebec are 'home' as well as 'field' to her. She writes that her own sense of belonging is cast between two homes but just partially for different reasons (2000: 64).

Canadian anthropologist Virginia Caputo, who conducted fieldwork on gender in Canadian children's lives for her Ph.D. dissertation in the same city where she resided at the time, analyses that the difficulty in distinguishing between fieldwork 'at home' and 'away' became most apparent when comparing her field site and those of the overseas students in her graduate cohort (2000: 25). While Caputo continually confronted a predicament in demonstrating that her fieldwork was 'real', neither group of overseas students—neither those who conducted their research locally like Caputo, nor those who returned 'home' to carry out their fieldwork—suffered the criticism that their fieldwork was not 'real'. This was because, as in the case of the former, conducting fieldwork in Canada was, in fact, 'abroad' for them, and as the case of the latter, carrying out research at their 'home'—places distant from the metropolitan West—meant 'real' fieldwork from the point of view of 'authentic' anthropology. In other words, for those overseas students coming from the non-West, both the Canadian city where they resided and their home, geographically distant from Canada, were 'home' as well as 'away', so that fieldwork conducted in either place was recognised as 'real' fieldwork by virtue of the 'away' element. Unlike the fieldwork conducted by these overseas students, Caputo's fieldwork was not recognised as 'away' in either sense. In her account of her fieldwork experience, however, Caputo notes that her continual coming and going to and from the field made the field indistinguishable from home and that communications technology such as telephones and fax machines further enhanced the blurring of the boundary between field and home.²⁵

The territorialised concept of the 'field', as well as that of the 'native', may have been the products of an oversimplified anthropological imagination even in the past, but in those days, when the world was not yet globalised, at least it was a sustainable imagination. In the present world where globalisation has taken hold, the traditional concepts of the 'native' and the 'field' become far more difficult to maintain. As the usefulness and appropriateness of the concept of the 'native' comes under question and the definition of the 'field' becomes broader, 'one's own culture/society' will become much more complicated, and the anthropology of 'home' will become increasingly diversified.

5. The Dichotomy between 'We' and 'They'

Throughout the history of 'home anthropology', the dichotomy between West and non-West, or between the 'native' and the 'non-native', has been predominant in the discourse. In a sense this may be unavoidable because anthropology has presupposed the distinction of 'we' and 'they', and 'we' has connoted 'Westerners', 'the investigators', and 'the

²⁵ Other researchers also point out that the development of communications technology has changed the nature of the 'field' and made the distinction of the 'home' and the 'field' less clear-cut (Pink 2000; Norman 2000).

representatives', whereas 'they' has implied 'non-Westerners', 'the investigated', and 'the represented'. It can be reasonably argued that 'home anthropology' should be differentiated when 'they' investigate 'them' and when 'we' research 'us'. The argument overlaps Strathern's assertion that auto-anthropology is only possible when a Western anthropologist studies his/her own society or culture with Western modelling (1987: 28-30). When considering the hegemony within the discipline, it becomes more difficult to regard 'home anthropology' done by Western anthropologists and by non-Western anthropologists as equal. It cannot be denied that there exists what Kuwayama calls the 'world system' of anthropology, in which the Western countries, mainly the United States, Great Britain, and France, are situated at the centre (Kuwayama 1997a, 1997b, 1997c, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2004a, 2004b), and that there is an asymmetrical power relationship between 'we' and 'they'. Under these circumstances, it is rather naïve to debate these two types of 'home anthropology' on the same basis.

To take an example, the number of Western anthropologists who study 'home' is, though growing, still quite small, while a vast majority of non-Western anthropologists choose 'home' as their area of study. And this cannot be dismissed as a mere coincidence. Yoshinobu Ota (1998: 260), a Japanese anthropologist who received his anthropological training in the United States, points out that when non-Westerners study anthropology in the West, there is a tacit agreement that they should study their own cultures. One may argue that most non-Western anthropologists in the West have become home anthropologists out of their own free choice, and not by the intrusion of Western anthropologists. Nevertheless, if their 'free' choice brings about a clearly unbalanced result, it is more reasonable to assume that there is some kind of intrusion or structural factor. Among non-Western anthropologists who are known in the West, an overwhelming majority work on their own cultures. In their job searches in the West, non-Western anthropologists who study other cultures have significantly fewer opportunities than those who study their own cultures.

This situation somewhat endorses the assertion by non-Western anthropologists that what is expected of non-Western anthropologists is not the contribution to anthropological theories as dialogical partners but just the provision of ethnographic data as knowledgeable 'native informants' (Narayan 1993; Kuwayama 2004a: 25-30; Ota 1998: 243, 260). Only very few Western anthropologists give ear to these assertions. On one hand, this indifference can be seen as a manifestation of the abovementioned 'world system' of anthropology. On the other hand, however, while non-Western anthropologists, including myself, have claimed that we are not expected to produce theories based on non-Western perspectives, we have not yet succeeded in effectively presenting them, and this seems to me to be one of the reasons for the indifference shown by Western anthropologists.

James Clifford expresses his expectation for the 'indigenous ethnographer' to 'offer new angles of vision and depths of understanding' (1986: 9) and remarks that new ethnographic possibilities are emerging from non-Western anthropology as well as feminist anthropology (1986: 19). However, while pointing out the great potential significance of feminist theorising for rethinking ethnographic writing (*ibid.*) and the contribution of feminism to anthropological theory (1986: 20), Clifford does not mention the contribution of 'indigenous ethnographers' to anthropological theory. Nor does he use such phrases as 'non-Western theorising'.

In fact, almost all non-Western home anthropologists who are highly regarded in the West received their anthropological training in the West, and they seem to be appreciated not so

much because they have propounded new non-Western theories as because they are as good as, or even better than, Western anthropologists at employing the anthropological theories and the Western modes of theorising that they learned in the West.

On this point, some non-Western anthropologists (Asad 1986: 157-158; Cheater 1987: 174-175; Kuwayama 2004a: 29) have argued that the Western dominated mode of anthropological discourse functions as an obstacle: in order to make their ideas and theories comprehensible to their Western counterparts, Non-Western anthropologists have to use Western languages (especially English), Western logic, and Western styles of modelling, and hence they are inevitably absorbed in the dominant discourse. What comes to mind here is the muted group theory presented by Edwin Ardener (1975a; 1975b) on the dominant-subordinate relationship between male and female modes of expression. He argued that the dominant groups in society generate and control the dominant modes of expression. Subordinate groups have alternative models of the world, but such models have to be transformed into terms of the dominant group so as to be understood. Even if a subordinated group speaks a lot in the terms of the dominant language, they are still muted or inarticulate because their models and/or views of the world cannot be expressed by the dominant modes of discourse. According to Ardener, any group which is silenced in this way can be considered a muted group.

Non-Western anthropologists, who have to employ Western languages, logic, and styles of modelling to make their voices heard by Western anthropologists and therefore become incorporated in the Western discourse, can be considered an example of such a muted group.²⁶ It would be an unreasonable demand that non-Western anthropologists present theories based on non-Western precepts and assumptions using Western modes of discourse. On the other hand, however, I do not think non-Western anthropologists have managed thus far to formulate anthropological theories based on non-Western views of the world by using non-Western modes of discourse.

It is true, as Yamashita et al (2004: 13-20) point out, that in East and South East Asian societies, anthropology has been increasingly indigenised, such that anthropology in each society differs from mainstream anthropology in the West. Nevertheless, the differences mentioned in their article are mainly those related to the institutional side of the discipline—the relationship between anthropology and adjacent disciplines (such as sociology), the relationship between anthropology and the state, the curriculum of anthropology, the selection of themes and sites, writing styles, and publishing customs. As for theories, anthropologists in Asia have something in common in that they apply Western frameworks or use theories that they create by modifying Western ones.

Non-Western anthropologists may not be expected to propound a set of theories not based on Western frameworks, but this cannot be used as an excuse for non-Western anthropologists to give up on efforts to generate such theories. Whether they are accepted by Western anthropologists or not, theories based on non-Western modes of thought should still be formulated. Of course, it is very likely that these theories will have very little currency outside of their local communities. I still think, however, that such an endeavour is worth pursuing because if we cannot even propose theories based on our own models of the world using our

²⁶ There is a touch of irony here, for the muted group theory is a Western theory suggested by a Western anthropologist.

own language, logic, and mode of thought, then the critique that has been repeatedly levelled against Western anthropologists will turn out to be criticism for the sake of criticism. Moreover, differences in the theories circulating in each community could be narrowed through dialogue and collaboration among non-Western anthropologists in order to enlarge the circulation of these theories.

Formulating such theories that not only contribute to home anthropology in the non-West but also give new perspectives to anthropology as a whole can be the first step to move beyond the dichotomy between ‘we’ and ‘they’.

6. Concluding Remarks

The legacy of colonial relationships in anthropology can be still found in the dichotomy between ‘we’ and ‘they’, ‘Westerners’ and ‘non-Westerners’, ‘the investigator’ and ‘the investigated’, and ‘the representative’ and ‘the represented’ even after the advent of postmodern anthropology, which has been a main critique of colonial legacy in the discipline. As I argued in the previous section, when it comes to the relationship between Western anthropologists and non-Western anthropologists, ‘we’ is equated with ‘Western anthropologists’ and ‘the theoriser’, and ‘they’ is equated with ‘non-Western anthropologists’ and ‘the informant’.

However, when we conduct fieldwork in today’s globalised and diversified world, we must face the fact that the dichotomy between ‘we’ and ‘they’, ‘West’ and ‘non-West’, and ‘natives’ and ‘non-natives’ is on the verge of collapsing. Indeed, it may have already collapsed, as anthropology has been transforming away from a discipline of ‘we’ (the Westerners) studying ‘them’ (non-Westerners) (Ahmed and Shore eds. 1995; Marcus 1998; Amit ed. 2000; MacClancy ed. 2002; Hume and Mulcock eds. 2004). As Ahmed and Shore point out, this trend implies that ‘anthropology must strive to become what it has always claimed to be: the study of *all* of humanity and not just “Other” cultures’ (Ahmed and Shore 1995: 30, emphasis original). However, transforming ‘anthropological knowledge’ from ‘Western knowledge’ into ‘human knowledge’ is not an easy task at all. How can non-Western anthropologists create non-Western theories for the discipline that is so heavily Euro-American? How can such theories extend their circulation? How can we make these theories comprehensible to Western anthropologists without accommodating Western modes of discourse? Given all of the difficulties ahead, these are the steps that must be taken for us to move beyond the dichotomy between ‘we’ and ‘they’. When ‘auto-anthropology’, which Strathern defines as ‘anthropology carried out in the social context which produced it’ and distributed in the West, begins to be distributed in the non-West as well, both home anthropology and anthropology as a whole will move into a new phase.

References

Abu-Lughod, Lila. 1991. ‘Writing against Culture’ in *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*. Ed. by R. Fox, pp. 137-162. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research

- Press.
- Aguilar, John L. 1981. 'Insider Research: An Ethnography of a Debate' in *Anthropologists at Home in North America: Methods and Issues in the Study of One's Own Society*. Ed. by D. Messerschmidt, pp. 15-26. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ahmed, Akbar S. 1984. Defining Islamic Anthropology. *Anthropology Today* 65: 2-4.
- Ahmed, Akbar S. and Cris N. Shore. 1995. 'Introduction: Is Anthropology Relevant to the Contemporary World?' in *The Future of Anthropology: Its Relevance to the Contemporary World*. Ed. by A. Ahmed and C. Shore, pp. 12-45. London: Athlone.
- Ahmed, Akbar S. and Cris N. Shore (eds.). 1995. *The Future of Anthropology: Its Relevance to the Contemporary World*. London: Athlone.
- Amit, Vered. (ed.) 2000. *Constructing the Field: Ethnographic Fieldwork in the Contemporary World*. London: Routledge.
- Appadurai, Arjun. 1988. Putting Hierarchy in Its Place. *Cultural Anthropology* 3:36-49.
- 1991. 'Global Ethnoscapes: Notes and Queries for a Transnational Anthropology' in *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*. Ed. by R. Fox, pp. 191-210. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Ardener, Edwin. 1975a. 'Belief and the Problem of Women' in *Perceiving Women*. Ed. by S. Ardener, pp. 1-17. London: Malaby Press. Originally in *The Interpretation of Ritual*. Ed. by Jean La Fontaine, 1972. London: Tavistock.
- 1975b. 'The "Problem" Revisited' in *Perceiving Women*. Ed. by S. Ardener, pp. 19-27. London: Malaby Press.
- Asad, Talal. 1980. Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries: A Further Elaboration. *Current Anthropology* 21(5): 661-662.
- 1986. 'The Concept of Cultural Translation in British Social Anthropology' in *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Ed. by J. Clifford and G. Marcus, pp. 141-164. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Asad, Talal. (ed.) 1973. *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. London: Ithaca Press.
- Babcock, B. 1980. Reflexivity: Definitions and Discriminations. *Semiotica* 30 (1/2): 1-14.
- Caputo, Virginia. 2000. 'At "Home" and "Away": Reconfiguring the Field for Late Twentieth-Century Anthropology', in *Constructing the Field: Ethnographic Fieldwork in the Contemporary World*. Ed. by V. Amit, pp. 19-31. London: Routledge.
- Cheater, Angela P. 1987. 'The Anthropologist as Citizen: The Diffracted Self?' in *Anthropology at Home*. Ed. by A. Jackson, pp. 164-179. London: Tavistock.
- Clifford, James. 1986. 'Introduction: Partial Truth' in *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Ed. by J. Clifford and G. Marcus, pp. 1-26. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 1988. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Clifford, James and Marcus, George E. (eds) 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Colson, Elizabeth. 1980. Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries: A Further Elaboration. *Current Anthropology* 21(5): 650-653.
- Driessen, Henk. (ed.) 1993. *The Politics of Ethnographic Reading and Writing: Confrontations of Indigenous and Western Views*. Saarbrücken: Verlag Breitenbach.

- Dyck, Noel. 2000. 'Home Field Advantage? Exploring the Social Construction of Children's Sports' in *Constructing the Field: Ethnographic Fieldwork in the Contemporary World*. Ed. by V. Amit, pp. 32-53. London: Routledge.
- Fahim, Hussein M. 1977. Foreign and Indigenous Anthropology: The Perspectives of an Egyptian Anthropologist. *Human Organization* 36: 80-86.
- Fahim, Hussein M. and Katherine Helmer. 1980. Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries: A Further Elaboration. *Current Anthropology* 21(5): 644-650.
- Fei, Xiao-T'ung (Fei, Xiaotong). 1939. *Peasant Life in China: A Field Study of Country Life in the Yangtze Valley*. London: George Routledge.
- Feng, Han-Yi. 1948. *The Chinese Kinship System*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Firth, Raymond. 1956. *Two Studies of Kinship in London* (LSE Monographs 15). London: Athlone Press.
- Firth, Raymond, Hubert, J. and Forge, A. 1969. *Families and Their Relatives: Kinship in a Middle Class Sector of London*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1988. *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Gefou-Madianou, Dimitra. 1993. 'Mirroring Ourselves through Western Texts: The Limits of an Indigenous Anthropology' in *The Politics of Ethnographic Reading and Writing: Confrontations of Indigenous and Western Views*. Ed. by H. Driessen, pp. 160-177. Fort Lauderdale: Verlag Breitenbach Publishers.
- Haas, Mary R. 1965. 'Other-Culture' vs. 'Own-Culture': Some Thoughts on L. White's Query. *American Anthropologist* 67: 1556-1560.
- Hau'ofa, Epeli. 1975. Anthropology and Pacific Islanders. *Oceania* XLV: 283-289.
- Hayano, David M. 1979. Auto-Ethnography: Paradigms, Problems, and Prospects. *Human Organization* 38: 99-104.
- Hsu, Francis L.K. 1945. Observation on Cross-Cousin Marriage in China. *American Anthropology* 47(1): 83-103.
- 1948. *Under Ancestor's Shadow: Chinese Culture and Personality*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hsu, Francis L.K. and Robert Textor. 1978. Third World Anthropologists and the Reappraisal of Anthropological Paradigms. *Anthropology Newsletter* 19(6): 11-12.
- Hu, Hsien-Chin 1948. *The Common Descent Group in China and Its Function*. New York: Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology, No. 10.
- Huizer, G. and Mannheim, B. (eds) 1979. *The Politics of Anthropology: From Colonialism and Sexism toward a View from Below*. The Hague: Mouton and Co.
- Hume, Lynne and Jane Mulcock. (eds) 2004. *Anthropologists in the Field: Cases in Participant Observation*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hymes, Dell. (ed.) 1969. *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York: Panteon.
- Jackson, Anthony. 1987. 'Reflections on Ethnography at Home and the ASA' in *Anthropology at Home*. Ed. by A. Jackson, pp. 1-15. London: Tavistock.
- Jackson, Anthony. (ed.) 1987. *Anthropology at Home*. London: Tavistock.
- Jones, Delmos J. 1970. Towards a Native Anthropology. *Human Organization* 29: 251-259.
- Kelman, Herbert C. 1980. Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries: A Further Elaboration. *Current Anthropology* 21(5): 655-661.

- Kenyatta, Jomo. 1938. *Facing Mount Kenya: The Tribal Life of the Gikuyu*. London: Secker and Warburg.
- Kim, Choong Soon. 1977. *An Asian Anthropologist in the South: Field Experiences with Blacks, Indians, and Whites*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press. (Reprinted in paperback 1984).
- 1990. The Role of the Non-Western Anthropologist Reconsidered: Illusion versus Reality. *Current Anthropology* 31(2): 196-201.
- Knowles, Caroline. 2000. 'Here and There: Doing Transnational Fieldwork' in *Constructing the Field: Ethnographic Fieldwork in the Contemporary World*. Ed. by V. Amit, pp. 54-70. London: Routledge.
- Koentjaraningrat. 1964. 'Anthropology and Non-Euro-American Anthropologists: The Situation in Indonesia' in *Explorations in Cultural Anthropology: Essays in Honor of George Peter Murdock*. Ed. by W.H. Goodenough, pp. 293-308. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Kurotani, Sawa. 2004. 'Multi-Sited Transnational Ethnography and the Shifting Construction of Fieldwork' in *Anthropologists in the Field: Case in Participant Observation*. Ed. by L. Hume and J. Mulcock, pp. 201-215. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kuwayama, Takami. 1997a. 『『現地』の人類学者—内外の日本研究を中心に』 ('Native' Anthropologists: With Special Reference to Japanese Studies Inside and Outside Japan). 『民族学研究』 (*Japanese Journal of Ethnology*) 61(4): 517-542.
- 1997b. 'Native Anthropologists: With Special Reference to Japanese Studies Inside and Outside Japan. *Japan Anthropology Workshop Newsletter* 26 and 27: 52-56.
- 1997c. Response to Jan van Bremen. *Japan Anthropology Workshop Newsletter* 26 and 27: 66-69.
- 2000. 'Native' Anthropologists: With Special Reference to Japanese Studies Inside and Outside Japan. *The Ritsumeikan Journal of Asia and Pacific Studies* 6: 7-33.
- 2001. 「ネイティヴの人類学の最前線」 (The Forefront of Native Anthropology). 『社会人類学年報』 (*Annual Report of Social Anthropology*) 27: 141-156.
- 2003. 'Natives' as Dialogic Partners: Some Thoughts on Native Anthropology. *Anthropology Today* 19 (1): 8-13.
- 2004a. *Native Anthropology: the Japanese Challenge to Western Academic Hegemony*. Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press.
- 2004b. 'The "World-System" of Anthropology: Japan and Asia in the Global Community of Anthropologists' in *The Making of Anthropology in East and Southeast Asia*. Ed. by Yamashita, Bosco, and Eades, pp. 35-56. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Leach, Edmund R. 1968. *A Runaway World?* London: British Broadcasting Corporation.
- 1969. *Genesis as Myth: And Other Essays*. London: Cape.
- 1982. *Social Anthropology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lewis, Diane. 1973. Anthropology and Colonialism. *Current Anthropology* 14(5): 581-591.
- Limón, José E. 1991. 'Representation, Ethnicity, and the Precursory Ethnography: Notes of a Native Anthropologist' in *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*. Ed. by R. Fox, pp. 115-135. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- MacClancy, Jeremy. (ed.) 2002. *Exotic No More: Anthropology on the Front Lines*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Madan, T.N. 1980. Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries: A Further Elaboration. *Current Anthropology* 21(5): 653-655.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. 1939. 'Preface' in *Peasant Life in China: A Field Study of Country Life in the Yangtze Valley*. By Fei, Xiao-T'ung, pp. xix-xxvi. London: George Routledge.
- Marcus, George E. 1980. Rhetoric and Ethnographic Genre in Anthropological Research. *Current Anthropology* 21(4):507-510.
- 1995. Ethnography in/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 95-117.
- 1998. *Ethnography through Thick and Thin*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Marcus, George E. and David Cushman. 1982. Ethnographies as Texts. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 11:25-69.
- Marcus, George E. and Michael Fischer. 1986. *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mascarenhas-Keyes, Stella. 1987. 'The Native Anthropologist: Constraints and Strategies in Research' in *Anthropology at Home*. Ed. by A. Jackson, pp. 180-195. London: Tavistock.
- Mead, Margaret. 1944. *The American Character*. New York: Penguin.
- 1967. *And Keep Your Powder Dry: An Anthropologist Looks at the American Character*. London: Ronald Whittings and Wheaton.
- Messerschmidt, Donald A. 1981. 'On Anthropology "at Home"' in *Anthropology at Home in North America: Methods and Issues in the Study of One's Own Society*. Ed. by D. Messerschmidt, pp. 3-14. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Messerschmidt, Donald A. (ed.) 1981. *Anthropology at Home in North America: Methods and Issues in the Study of One's Own Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moon, Okpyo. 1989. *From Paddy Field to Ski Slope: The Revitalisation of Tradition in Japanese Village*. Manchester: University of Manchester Press.
- Motzafi-Haller, Pnina. 1997. 'Writing Birthright: On Native Anthropologists and the Politics of Representation' in *Auto/Ethnography, Rewriting the Self and the Social*. Ed. by D. Reed-Danahay, pp. 195-222. Oxford: Berg.
- Muir, Stewart. 2004. 'Not Quite at Home: Field Envy and New Age Ethnographic Dis-ease' in *Anthropologists in the Field: Cases in Participant Observation*. Ed. by L. Hume and J. Mulcock, pp. 185-200. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Nakagawa, Yuri. 2005. 「『われわれ』と『彼ら』の二分法を超えて—『ホームの人類学』の歴史と展望」 (Moving beyond the Dichotomy of 'We' and 'They': Retrospect and Prospect in 'Home Anthropology'). 『自社会研究としての人類学確立に向けた基礎的研究』 (Basic Studies toward the Establishment of Cultural Anthropology as Studies of Home Society) 文科省科学研究費補助金研究成果報告書：課題番号 14310151 (Kaken Report: 14310151). Ed. by Yūji Nakanishi, pp. 43-58.
- 2006. 「『ホーム』がフィールドになる時—ホーム・アンソロポロジストの利点と欠点を巡る議論の再考」 (When 'Home' Becomes Field: Rethinking the Debate over Advantages and Disadvantages of Home Anthropologists) 『専修大学人文研年報』 (Annual Report of the Institute of Humanities at Senshu University) 36: 123-155.
- Nakane, Chie. 1967. *Garo and Khasi: A Comparative Study in Matrilineal Systems*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Nakanishi, Yuji. 2003. 「私は人類学者なのか?—“日本の文化人類学”という制度を考

- える」 (Am I an Anthropologist?: Thinking 'Cultural Anthropology in Japan' as an Academic System) 『福岡大学人文論叢』 (*Fukuoka University Review of Literature & Humanities*) 39 (2):1-31.
- Nakhleh, Khalil. 1973. On Being a Native Anthropologist. Paper Presented for the IXth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, August 28 - September 8.
- Narayan, Kirin. 1993. How Native is a 'Native' Anthropologist? *American Anthropologist* 95: 671-686.
- Norman, Karin. 2000. 'Phoning the Field: Meanings of Place and Involvement in Fieldwork "at Home"' in *Constructing the Field: Ethnographic Fieldwork in the Contemporary world*. Ed. by V. Amit, pp. 120-146. London: Routledge.
- Ohnuki-Tierney, Emiko. 1984. 'Native' Anthropologists. *American Ethnologist* 11: 584-586.
- Okely, Judith. 1975. The Self and Scientism. *Journal of the Social Anthropology Society Oxford* 6 (3): 171-188.
- 1984. Fieldwork in the Home Counties. *RAIN* 61:4-6.
- Ota, Yoshinobu. 1998. 『トランスポジションの思想—文化人類学の再想像』 (*Transpositional Thought: Re-imagining Cultural Anthropology*). Tokyo: Sekai Shisō Sha.
- Overing, Joanna. (ed.) 1985. *Reason and Morality*. London: Tavistock.
- Owusu, Maxwell. 1978. Ethnography of Africa: The Usefulness of the Useless. *American Anthropologist* 80: 310-334.
- Parkin, David. (ed.) 1982. *Semantic Anthropology*. London: Academic Press.
- Pink, Sarah. 2000. ' "Informants" Who Come "Home" ' in *Constructing the Field: Ethnographic Fieldwork in the Contemporary World*. Ed. by V. Amit, pp. 96-119. London: Routledge.
- Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. 1952. 'Introduction' in *Religion and Society among the Coorgs of South India*. By M.N. Srinivas, pp. vii-xi. Oxford: Little Clarendon Press.
- Rapport, Nigel and Joanna Overing. 2000. *Social and Cultural Anthropology: The Key Concepts*. London: Routledge.
- Ruby, Jay. (ed.) 1982. *A Crack in the Mirror: Reflexive Perspectives in Anthropology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. London: Routledge.
- Schneider, David M. 1968. *American Kinship: A Cultural Account*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Scholte, Bob. 1969. 'Toward a Reflexive and Critical Anthropology' in *Reinventing Anthropology*. Ed. by D. Hymes, pp. 430-457. New York: Pantheon.
- Shamsul, Amri Baharuddin. 1982. The Superiority of Indigenous Scholars?: Some Facts and Fallacies with Special Reference to Malay Anthropologists and Sociologists in Fieldwork. *Manusia dan masyarakat (Man and Society)* 3: 24-33.
- Shuttleworth, Russell. 2004. 'Multiple Roles, Statuses, and Allegiances: Exploring the Ethnographic Process in Disability Culture' in *Anthropologists in the Field: Case in Participant Observation*. Ed. by L. Hume and J. Mulcock, pp. 46-58. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Spencer, Jonathan. 1989. Anthropology as a Kind of Writing. *Man* (ns) 24 (1): 145-164.
- Srinivas, M.N. 1942. *Marriage and Family in Mysore*. Bombay: New Book Co.
- 1952. *Religion and Society among the Coorgs of South India*. Oxford: Clarendon

- Press.
- 1966. 'Some Thoughts on the Study of One's Own Society' in *Social Change in Modern India*. By M.N. Srinivas, pp. 147-163. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 1976. *The Remembered Village*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Strathern, Marilyn. 1987. 'The Limits of Auto-Anthropology' in *Anthropology at Home*. Ed. by A. Jackson, pp. 16-37. London: Tavistock.
- Strauss, Sarah. 2000. 'Locating Yoga: Ethnography and Transnational Practice' in *Constructing the Field: Ethnographic Fieldwork in the Contemporary World*. Ed. by V. Amid, pp. 147-161. London: Routledge.
- Stuchlik, Milan. 1973. Comments (for Diane Lewis's Paper). *Current Anthropology* 14(5): 597-598.
- Suenari, Michio. 1992. 'Anthropology of One's Own Society in East Asia' in *Homebound: Studies in East Asian Society*. Edited by C. Nakane and C. Chiao, pp. 59-79. Tokyo: The Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies.
- Tan, Chee-Beng. 2004. 'Anthropology and Indigenization in a Southeast Asian State: Malaysia' in *The Making of Anthropology in East and Southeast Asia*. Ed. by Yamashita, Bosco, and Eades, pp. 307-334. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Tanabe, Shigeharu. 1994. *Ecology and Practical Technology: Peasant Farming Systems in Thailand*. Bangkok: White Lotus.
- Teaiwa, Katerina Martina. 2004. 'Multi-Sited Methodologies: 'Homework' in Australia, Fiji, and Kiribati' in *Anthropologists in the Field: Case in Participant Observation*. Ed. by L. Hume and J. Mulcock, pp. 216-233. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Uchendu, Victor. 1965. *The Igbo of Southeast Nigeria*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Wax, Murray L. 1976. Introduction to the Plenary Address of the 35th Annual Meeting of the Society for Applied Anthropology, Saint Louis, Missouri. *Human Organization* 35: 331-333.
- Wulff, Helena. 2000. 'Access to a Closed World: Methods for a Multilocal Study on Ballet as a Career' in *Constructing the Field: Ethnographic Fieldwork in the Contemporary World*. Ed. by V. Amit, pp. 147-161. London: Routledge.
- Yamashita, Shinji, Joseph Bosco, and J.S. Eades. 2004. 'Asian Anthropologies: Foreign, Native and Indigenous' in *The Making of Anthropology in East and Southeast Asia*. Ed. by Yamashita, Bosco, and Eades, pp. 1-34. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Yang, Martin C. 1945. *A Chinese Village: Taitou, Shantung Province*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- 1972. 'How A Chinese Village was Written' in *Crossing Cultural Boundaries: The Anthropological Experience*, pp. 63-73. Ed. by S. T. Kimball and J. B. Watson. San Francisco: Chandler.